



Citation	Schetz M, Gunst J, (2015), Recovery from AKI in the critically ill: potential confounders in the evaluation. Intensive Care Med. 2015 Sep;41(9):1648-57.
Archived version	Author manuscript: the content is identical to the content of the published paper, but without the final typesetting by the publisher
Published version	http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00134-015-3946-3
Journal homepage	http://link.springer.com/journal/134
Author contact	greet.vandenberghe@med.kuleuven.be + 32 (0)16 344021
IR	https://lirias.kuleuven.be/handle/123456789/501398

(article begins on next page)



**Recovery from AKI in the critically ill:
potential confounders in the evaluation.**

Schetz M, MD, PhD; Gunst J, MD, PhD; De Vlieger G, MD; Van den Berghe G, MD, PhD

Clinical Department and Laboratory of Intensive Care Medicine
Division of Cellular and Molecular Medicine
KU Leuven University
Herestraat 49, B-3000 Leuven
Belgium

Address for correspondence:

Marie.schetz@uzleuven.be

Tel 3216344021

Fax 3216344015

Conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest related to the subject of the study.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Studies on recovery from acute kidney injury (AKI) in ICU patients yield variable results. We assessed, in a heterogeneous ICU population, the impact of different recovery definitions, of different exclusion criteria and of imputing missing baseline creatinine on AKI recovery.

Methods: Secondary analysis of the EPaNIC-database. Recovery of kidney function in patients who developed AKI in ICU was assessed at hospital discharge. We studied recovery rates of different AKI stages with different definitions of recovery after inclusion or exclusion of non-survivors and in patients with or without chronic kidney disease (CKD). In addition, the impact of imputing missing baseline creatinine was investigated.

Results: 1310 AKI patients were studied of which 977 were discharged alive from hospital. Rate of complete recovery (absence of KDIGO criteria) was markedly higher in survivors than in all AKI patients (79.5% vs 67.0%), especially for more severe forms of AKI. For patients with CKD, only the need for renal replacement therapy worsened kidney outcome as compared with no-CKD patients. Using stricter definitions of complete recovery significantly reduced its occurrence. New or worsening CKD occurred in 30% of AKI survivors. In no-CKD patients with available baseline creatinine, using an imputed baseline did not affect recovery. Patients with unavailable baseline creatinine were different from those with known baseline and revealed different recovery patterns.

Conclusion: These results indicate the need for rigorous description of AKI severity, the included population, definitions and baseline creatinine handling in reports on AKI recovery.

Key words: AKI – recovery – definition – baseline imputation

Take home message: reports on recovery from AKI should clearly describe the applied definitions, AKI severity, the study population and the proportion of patients with imputed baseline.

140-character tweet: recovery from AKI should clearly describe definitions, AKI severity, study population and proportion of patients with imputed baseline.

INTRODUCTION

Several large observational studies have shown an association between acute kidney injury (AKI) and long-term mortality and the development of chronic kidney disease/end-stage renal disease (CKD/ESRD) [1,2]. Even a complete recovery from AKI has been suggested to predispose to long-term adverse outcomes [3-8], whereas absent or only partial recovery further aggravates this predisposition [4,9-12].

Most studies reporting short-term recovery from AKI used older definitions of AKI and/or focused on independence from dialysis in dialysis-requiring AKI [13,14]. Data on the renal outcome of AKI in ICU patients defined by modern definitions (RIFLE, AKIN, KDIGO) that also include less severe forms are scarce [13-26]. In addition, available studies are often small and limited to specific surgical populations [19-21,26,27], used only administrative or laboratory databases [10,11,25] or also included non-ICU patients [10,11,15,17,22,24,25].

Evaluation of AKI recovery is hampered by the lack of a generally accepted definition. The available reports used definitions based on absence of RIFLE criteria [4,17,24], return to baseline serum creatinine (Screat) [11,19,27] or a discharge Screat that returned to a value below 1.1 or 1.25 times baseline [7,10,16,20]. Few studies reported recovery according to AKI severity [4,11,15] and none of these studies used the KDIGO criteria [28] for both diagnosis of AKI and for assessment of recovery. Using new-onset CKD or worsening of pre-existing CKD to define absence of recovery may be more clinically relevant in determining the need for nephrological follow-up [29].

The optimal timing to evaluate recovery is also unclear. The majority of the available studies reported recovery at hospital discharge [17,19-25]. With the exception of studies focusing on long-term follow-up [4,5,10], recovery is mostly reported for all AKI patients (survivors and non-survivors) [15,16,18,19,21-23,26]. Although inclusion of non-survivors is important from a pathophysiological point of view and essential for intervention trials, recovery of kidney

function among survivors is probably more relevant from a patient's perspective and crucial for determining the burden of postdischarge nephrological follow-up. In- or excluding non-survivors is expected to have a pronounced effect on the degree of renal recovery, especially in the most severe forms of AKI with the highest risk of death.

Another complicating factor in determining AKI recovery is the fact that a baseline Screat is often missing. The available clinical trials either excluded patients with an unknown baseline Screat [9,19], used an imputed baseline Screat based on the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease (MDRD) equation (as suggested by ADQI and KDIGO) [4,16,17,23,25], used the minimum Screat measured during hospitalization [5,21] or did not mention how baseline Screat was determined [18,24]. The impact of using an imputed instead of the observed baseline on the incidence of AKI has been reported [30-32]. However, the impact of baseline Screat imputation on AKI recovery has not been studied.

The aim of the current investigation was to compare the rate of complete, partial or absent recovery from different stages of AKI, defined by KDIGO criteria, in a large heterogeneous ICU population using different definitions of renal recovery, with in- and exclusion of non-survivors and for patients with pre-existing CKD versus those without CKD. Our second aim was to assess the impact of using an imputed versus the true baseline Screat on the pattern of renal recovery.

METHODS

Patients

This is a secondary analysis of the EPaNIC database [33]. EPaNIC was a prospective multicenter RCT of 4640 adult ICU patients who, between August 2007 and November 2010, were randomly assigned to early or late addition of parenteral nutrition to insufficient enteral nutrition. Written informed consent was obtained from all patients or their designated representatives. The institutional review board of the University Hospitals Leuven and the

Belgian authorities approved the protocol. For the present analysis patients were excluded if they were on chronic dialysis, were admitted after kidney transplantation or had incomplete data on kidney function during ICU stay. Baseline characteristics, including demographics, comorbidities and clinical parameters of illness severity were recorded. Daily clinical and biochemical data were entered in the study database.

Definition of AKI

AKI was classified according to the KDIGO criteria [28], however not taking into account the urine output. The “0.3mg/dL increase of Screat over 48h” criterion was only applied during ICU stay. As baseline Screat, we used the lowest Screat during the 3 months prior to ICU admission for elective admissions and the lowest Screat from 3 months to 1 week before ICU admission for emergency admissions. Screat was searched from the hospital database or manually retrieved by searching documents from referring hospitals/physicians. In case of missing values a baseline Screat was imputed from the MDRD formula assuming an estimated GFR of 75ml/min per 1.73m² [29]. The maximal AKI stage (AKI_{max}) during ICU stay was recorded.

Impact of the definition used to identify renal recovery at hospital discharge

Definitions using serum creatinine criteria

The first definition of recovery was based on the presence or absence of KDIGO criteria taking into account dialysis dependence and the percentage change of Screat compared with baseline. For patients with AKI stage 1 we separately evaluated the cohorts with 0.3mg/dL increase of Screat in 48h only and no other AKI criteria (further referred to as stage 1-0.3) and the cohort with 50% increase (further referred to as stage 1-50%). For patients with stage 3 we separated the 3-fold increase of serum creatinine and the need for renal replacement therapy (RRT) subcategories. Complete recovery from AKI was defined as being discharged from hospital without AKI (Screat below 1.5 times the baseline value). A reduction in AKI stage compared with AKI_{max} was defined as partial recovery. Because of the important impact of dialysis need on health status patients with AKI stage 3 with need for RRT that did not need dialysis at

hospital discharge but still had AKI were also considered as partial recovery, even if they remained in stage 3. Absence of recovery was defined as persistent AKI_{max} (persistent need for RRT for stage 3 with RRT) or worsening of AKI stage after ICU discharge. Besides the KDIGO criteria we also assessed 2 stricter definitions defining complete recovery as a return to below 1.25 times baseline Screat or as a complete return to baseline Screat (without dialysis need).

Definition using eGFR criteria

This definition of recovery was based on the eGFR (MDRD equation) at hospital discharge in AKI survivors. Patients with discharge eGFR < 60 ml/min/1.73 m² were considered as potential CKD, since CKD strictu sensu requires a GFR below 60 ml/min/1.73 m² for at least 3 months. We also determined the proportion of “new potential CKD” in patients without pre-existing CKD and the worsening of pre-existing CKD using the KDOQI classification [34].

Impact of the study population regarding survival status and pre-existing CKD

The renal recovery pattern of different stages of AKI_{max} in all AKI patients was compared with the subgroup of hospital survivors only. In addition, patients with pre-existing CKD were compared with those without CKD.

Impact of imputation for missing baseline serum creatinine values

For this analysis we excluded patients with stage 1-0.3 because this stage does not use a premorbid baseline creatinine. In AKI patients who survived to hospital-discharge and for whom baseline Screat was available, we compared the pattern of recovery with the true or calculated baseline: the “true baseline group” comprised the patients where both development and recovery of AKI was assessed with the true baseline and the “calculated baseline group” comprised the patients where both development and recovery of AKI was assessed with the calculated baseline. This analysis was performed in all AKI survivors and in the subgroup without pre-existing CKD. The “imputed baseline group” comprised the patients where the baseline was actually missing and had to be calculated. Their baseline characteristics and pattern of recovery were compared with the “calculated baseline group” without CKD.

Statistical analyses

Continuous variables are expressed as medians and interquartile ranges (IQR) and compared with Wilcoxon or Kruskal-Wallis tests as appropriate. Categorical variables are expressed as frequencies and proportions and compared using the Chi-Square test or Fisher's exact test. Agreement between two methods to evaluate recovery in the same population was assessed with kappa statistics and the Bowker's test of symmetry. Statistical analysis was performed using JMP 10 software (SAS Institute, Cary, NC) and a two-tailed p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant, without correction for multiple testing.

RESULTS

Patients

The EPaNIC study [33] included 4640 patients. The nutritional strategy itself had no significant impact on recovery from AKI [35]. From the original study population, 56 patients were excluded for ESRD, 15 for kidney transplantation and 9 for missing data required for this study. AKI was diagnosed in 1310/4560 patients (28.7%). Hundred and sixty patients (12.2%) had stage 1-0.3 and 425 (32.4%) had stage 1-50%; 213 (16.3%) had stage 2; 164 (12.5%) had stage 3 without need for RRT and 348 (26.6%) needed RRT. Baseline characteristics and outcomes are described in [Table 1 of the electronic supplement](#). Baseline Creat was unavailable in 31% of these AKI patients and this increased from 21% in patients with AKI stage 1 to 43% in patients with AKI stage 3. Pre-existing CKD was present in 24%. Mortality, ICU and hospital stay increased with increasing AKI severity.

Impact of the definition and the study population

Kidney outcome with KDIGO definition in the whole population versus survivors only

Discharge KDIGO classification for the different levels of AKI_{max} is shown in [table 1](#), for all AKI patients and for survivors only. Survivors had 79.4% complete recovery, 10.8% partial

recovery and 9.8% absent recovery whereas these proportions were 30.6%, 12.3% and 57.1% for the non-survivors ($p<0.0001$). Death or no recovery occurred in 429 (32.7%). In comparison with the survivors the whole population had less complete recovery (67%) and more absent recovery (21.8%). This difference was most pronounced for the more severe AKI stages ([Fig 1](#)). In AKI stage 3 with need for RRT, complete recovery was 60% in survivors and 37% in the total population. The characteristics of non-surviving patients and of survivors with complete, partial and absent recovery are shown in [Table 2 of the electronic supplement](#). Important differences between the recovery groups existed with regard to baseline kidney function, emergency admission, Apache II score and AKI severity.

Kidney outcome according to AKI severity

As expected, complete recovery among survivors decreased substantially with increasing AKI severity (from 97.2% in stage 1-0.3 to 59.7% in stage 3 with RRT) ($p<0.0001$). In patients with AKI stage 3, the recovery pattern also significantly differed between the subgroups with and without need for RRT ($p<0.0001$) ([Fig 1](#)).

Kidney outcome with KDIGO versus stricter definitions

Defining complete recovery as a complete return to baseline Screat or as a return to below 1.25 times the baseline Screat reduced the proportion of complete recovery in survivors from 79.4% to 42%, respectively 66%, with a parallel increase of partial recovery ($p<0.0001$) ([Table 2](#)).

Kidney outcome in patients with versus without CKD

Pre-existing CKD was present in 320 patients, of whom 81 (25.3%) died. Surviving patients with pre-existing CKD appeared to have a better renal outcome than those without CKD with the exception of patients requiring RRT ([Fig 1 electronic supplement](#)).

Kidney outcome with eGFR definition (new or worsening CKD)

Amongst the 977 AKI survivors, 420 (43%) had potential CKD at hospital discharge, the largest proportion being seen in stage 3 with need for RRT ([Table 2](#)). New or worsening CKD was

seen in 290 (29.6%) survivors, including new potential CKD in 230 (31%) of the 738 patients without pre-existing CKD and worsening CKD in 60 (25%) of the 239 AKI survivors with pre-existing CKD. Somewhat surprising, 49 (20%) of the CKD patients had an eGFR above 60 at hospital discharge. These patients had a higher baseline eGFR (50.8 (43-56.7) versus 39.4 (30.6-48.6); $p<0.0001$) and a longer hospital stay compared with those with persistent CKD (29 (21-56) versus 22 (15-38); $p=0.011$).

Impact of using imputation for missing baseline serum creatinine

Comparing recovery in the “true baseline group” ($n=577$) with the “calculated baseline group” ($n=725$) (Fig 2A and Table 3 electronic supplement) showed less complete recovery with the calculated baseline (59.6% vs 80.4%; $p<0.0001$). However, repeating the same analysis in the subgroup of patients without CKD ($n=411/291$) showed no difference in recovery pattern ($p=0.3$). Compared with the “calculated baseline group” without CKD the “imputed baseline group” ($n=258$) had worse recovery ($p<0.0001$) (Fig 2B and Table 3 electronic supplement). Even after correction for AKI severity, the unavailability of a true baseline remained associated with less complete recovery (OR 0.69 (0.47-0.97). Comparing baseline characteristics of survivors with available and unavailable baseline showed significant differences. The “obligatory imputed patients” had less comorbidity, more emergency admissions, more sepsis on admission, higher illness severity, more AKI on admission and more severe AKI. They also had a longer ICU and hospital stay (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

This analysis describing renal recovery from AKI in a heterogeneous ICU population, showed that the pattern of recovery from AKI depends on the study population and on the definitions applied. AKI recovery, especially from the most severe forms, was markedly better when only survivors are considered. Pre-existing CKD only worsened renal outcome in stage 3 with need

for RRT. Not unexpectedly, recovery decreased with increasing AKI severity, with worst kidney outcome for the subgroup of AKI stage 3 with the need for RRT. The use of a more strict definition of recovery substantially reduced the proportion of complete recovery at the expense of more partial recovery. New or worsening CKD was present in 30% of the patients. Using a calculated versus a true baseline Screat in patients with available baseline did not affect recovery in patients without pre-existing CKD. However, patients with unavailable and thus obligatory imputed baseline creatinine had different baseline characteristics and a different recovery pattern when compared with those with available baseline Screat. These results plead for a clear description of the included population (in- or exclusion of non-survivors, proportion of CKD, AKI severity, method used for baseline creatinine assessment and proportion of patients with imputed baseline) in studies on this topic.

Although one could argue that kidney outcome should be assessed in all AKI patients, the inclusion of non-survivors (as in [16,18,19,22-24,26]) not only induces bias (as patients may not have had enough time to recover before they died) but being dead with recovered kidneys also has little significance from a patient's perspective. Since mortality increases with increasing AKI severity exclusion of non-survivors mainly affects the recovery pattern of more severe forms of AKI. Worsening renal recovery with increasing severity of AKI confirms previous findings [4,11,15,19,20] and underscores the importance of clearly reporting AKI severity, including the need for RRT in stage 3.

The proportion of CKD patients included in the available studies on AKI recovery varies widely between 5% and 39% [16,20-23,25,26]. Renal outcome of AKI patients with preexisting CKD has been reported to be worse [15,19,20,36], similar [11,22] or better [10] than in no-CKD patients. In our cohort the presence of CKD appeared to result in a better renal outcome for the less severe AKI forms. This may potentially be explained by selection bias, as comorbidity determines the indication for postoperative ICU admission. CKD patients indeed had more elective admissions, a lower APACHE II score and a shorter hospital stay (data not shown). However,

in those patients requiring RRT, the presence of CKD adversely affected recovery, as has been described previously [14,20,36].

An ideal definition of recovery from AKI would compare baseline, minimal and final kidney function with a golden standard for GFR measurement such as inulin clearance. Since this is impossible in clinical practice clinicians will have to rely on the parameters that are available i.e. serum creatinine and the derived eGFR and AKI staging. Serum creatinine is not an ideal parameter to assess kidney outcome in ICU patients that frequently develop muscle wasting. Indeed, others and we have previously shown decreases in serum creatinine during ICU stay in patients without AKI [37,38]. Also in this analysis, 40% of the AKI survivors with true baseline (n=673) had a discharge creatinine lower than baseline (data not shown), suggesting that recovery may have been overestimated.

We primarily defined recovery of AKI as the absence of AKI by the same criteria that are used for its diagnosis. Defining recovery from a disease as absence of this disease seems the most logical approach. Many studies used more strict definitions [7,10,16,19,20,22,24], which, as we have shown, only caused a shift from complete to partial recovery. Whether the difference in complete recovery between KDIGO and more strict definitions has implications for long-term outcome remains to be investigated.

The most meaningful outcome from a patient's perspective and for determining the need for nephrological follow-up is the presence of new or worsening CKD, which predominantly occurs in the most severe stages of AKI. We recognize that eGFR at hospital discharge may not be an ideal method to estimate recovery. Indeed, we have previously shown that eGFR in comparison with 24h creatinine clearance overestimates recovery at ICU discharge as a result of muscle wasting resulting in a reduced creatinine generation, especially in patients with prolonged ICU stay [37]. This phenomenon may also explain the 20% of the CKD patients who were "healed" from their CKD after an episode of AKI. Compared with those with persistent

CKD, these patients indeed had longer hospital stays and a baseline eGFR closer to the 60ml/min/1.73m² limit.

Which of the evaluated definitions should be recommended in clinical practice depends on the context and purpose. For determining the need for nephrological follow-up and from a patient's perspective the CKD status in survivors is likely the most meaningful, whereas in an intervention trial targeted at renal recovery, recovery has to be defined in comparison with baseline kidney function and assessed in the whole population, taking into account the competing end-point of mortality. Whether the absence of AKI criteria or stricter definitions of recovery are more appropriate requires further investigation on the relationship of these definitions of recovery with long-term patient and kidney outcome.

Imputation of baseline Screat in patients with unavailable baseline is proposed by both ADQI and KDIGO [28] and was actually used in several clinical trials on AKI recovery [4,16,17,23,25]. We noted that patients with unknown baseline Screat had less complete recovery when compared with those with available baseline. This may be explained by the assumptions about the normality of kidney function prior to ICU admission that underlies this strategy and may thus result in underestimation of recovery in patients with “hidden” CKD. In addition, patients with unknown baseline showed different baseline characteristics, which may also explain their different recovery pattern. Exclusion of patients with unavailable baseline may therefore induce ascertainment bias. The proportion of patients with imputed baseline creatinine should be clearly reported, especially since the need for imputation was higher in the most severe forms of AKI.

Strengths of this study are the large sample size, the use of a consensus definition for AKI diagnosis and active searching for baseline Screat, being available in the majority of the included patients, despite the high proportion of emergency admissions. On the other hand, this study also has limitations. We did not use the urine output criteria because these data were not available. It is possible that patients with both creatinine and urine output criteria or those

reaching a higher AKI severity due to oliguria criteria may have different recovery patterns. This will require further investigation. A recent analysis showed that patients reaching stage 3 by both urine output and creatinine criteria have worse short- and long-term survival and dialysis need than those with either creatinine or oliguria alone [39]. The patient population was mainly surgical (79% of AKI patients). However, more than 40% had sepsis on admission and less than 50% were elective postoperative admissions, suggesting that the majority of the surgical patients were admitted after emergency surgery or after postoperative complications had developed (“medical patients with a scarf”). We did not use a fixed time point to assess recovery. Hospital discharge might be a too early time point to assess AKI recovery for two reasons: there is not enough time for recovery or patients may have developed muscle wasting resulting in decreased creatinine generation and thus overestimation of AKI recovery [37,38]. Restoration of muscle mass with rehabilitation after hospital discharge may then result in an apparent deterioration of kidney function. This phenomenon may also result in overestimation of recovery when the minimum S_{creat} during hospitalization is used as a surrogate for baseline S_{creat}. On the other hand, most reports on AKI recovery have reported kidney outcome at hospital discharge [17,19-25].

Reliable data on AKI recovery have significant implications for planning nephrological follow-up [40-42], for comparative research and for power calculations in future intervention studies. Our analysis suggests that, in order to be comparable, reports on recovery from AKI should provide detailed data on the included population (in-or exclusion of non-survivors, proportion of CKD), on the definition and severity of AKI, on the definition used for and the timing of recovery assessment and on the handling of missing baseline creatinine.

Fig legends

Fig 1. Proportion of complete, partial and absent recovery for the total AKI group and split by different stages of AKI_{max} in all AKI patients (blue) (n=1310) and in hospital survivors only (green) (n=997).

Fig 2. A. Recovery in the “true baseline group” (n=577) (blue bars) and the “calculated baseline group (n=725) (green bars) - B. Recovery in no CKD patients in the “true baseline group (n=411) (blue bars) , the calculated baseline group (n= 291) (green bars) and in the “imputed baseline group (n=258) (gray bars) (see text for explanation of group composition)

Fig 1 electronic supplement. Proportion of complete, partial and absent recovery for all patients and subgroups with different stages of AKI_{max} in survivors with available baseline without CKD (blue) (n=452) and with CKD (green) (n=239).

References

1. Cohen SD, Kimmel P (2012) Long-term sequelae of acute kidney injury in the ICU. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 18:623-8
2. Chawla LS1, Eggers PW, Star RA, Kimmel PL (2014) Acute kidney injury and chronic kidney disease as interconnected syndromes. *N Engl J Med* 371:58-66
3. Loef BG, Epema AH, Smilde TD, Henning RH, Ebels T, Navis G, Stegeman CA (2005) Immediate postoperative renal function deterioration in cardiac surgical patients predicts in-hospital mortality and long-term survival. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 16:195-200
4. Bihorac A1, Yavas S, Subbiah S, Hobson CE, Schold JD, Gabrielli A, Layon AJ, Segal MS (2009) Long-term risk of mortality and acute kidney injury during hospitalization after major surgery. *Ann Surg* 249:851-8
5. Bucaloiu ID, Kirchner HL, Norfolk ER, Hartle JE 2nd, Perkins RM (2012) Increased risk of death and de novo chronic kidney disease following reversible acute kidney injury. *Kidney Int* 81:477-85
6. Lafrance JP, Djurdjev O, Levin A (2010) Incidence and outcomes of acute kidney injury in a referred chronic kidney disease cohort. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 25:2203-9
7. Jones J, Holmen J, De Graauw J, Jovanovich A, Thornton S, Chonchol M (2012) Association of Complete Recovery From Acute Kidney Injury With Incident CKD Stage 3 and All-Cause Mortality. *Am J Kidney Dis* 60:402-8
8. Wang AY, Bellomo R, Cass A, Finfer S, Gattas D, Myburgh J, Chadban S, Hirakawa Y, Ninomiya T, Li Q, Lo S, Barzi F, Sukkar L, Jardine M, Gallagher M; POST-RENAL Study Investigators and the ANZICS Clinical Trials Group. Health-related Quality of Life in Survivors of Acute Kidney Injury: the Post-RENAL Study Outcomes. *Nephrology (Carlton)*. 2015 Apr 19. doi: 10.1111/nep.12488. [Epub ahead of print]
9. Wu VC, Huang TM, Lai CF, Shiao CC, Lin YF, Chu TS, Wu PC, Chao CT, Wang JY, Kao TW, Young GH, Tsai PR, Tsai HB, Wang CL, Wu MS, Chiang WC, Tsai IJ, Hu FC, Lin SL, Chen YM, Tsai TJ, Ko WJ, Wu KD (2011) Acute-on-chronic kidney injury

at hospital discharge is associated with long-term dialysis and mortality. *Kidney Int* 80:1222-30

10. Pannu N, James M, Hemmelgarn B, Klarenbach S; Alberta Kidney Disease Network (2013) Association between AKI, recovery of renal function, and long-term outcomes after hospital discharge. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 8:194-202.
11. Talabani B1, Zouwail S, Pyart RD, Meran S, Riley SG, Phillips AO (2014) Epidemiology and outcome of community-acquired acute kidney injury. *Nephrology (Carlton)* 19:282-7
12. Sawhney S, Mitchell M, Marks A, Fluck N, Black C. (2015) Long-term prognosis after acute kidney injury (AKI): what is the role of baseline kidney function and recovery? A systematic review. *BMJ Open* 5:e006497.
13. Macedo E, Bouchard J, Mehta RL (2008) Renal recovery following acute kidney injury. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 14:660-5
14. Bagshaw SM (2006) Epidemiology of renal recovery after acute renal failure. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 12:544-50
15. Ali T1, Khan I, Simpson W, Prescott G, Townend J, Smith W, Macleod A (2007) Incidence and outcomes in acute kidney injury: a comprehensive population-based study. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 18:1292-8
16. Garzotto F, Piccinni P, Cruz D, Gramaticopolo S, Dal Santo M, Aneloni G, Kim JC, Rocco M, Alessandri E, Giunta F, Michetti V, Iannuzzi M, Belluomo Anello C, Brienza N, Carlini M, Pelaia P, Gabbanelli V, Ronco C; NEFROINT investigation group (2011) RIFLE-based data collection/management system applied to a prospective cohort multicenter Italian study on the epidemiology of acute kidney injury in the intensive care unit. *Blood Purif* 31:159-71
17. Srisawat N1, Murugan R, Lee M, Kong L, Carter M, Angus DC, Kellum JA; Genetic and Inflammatory Markers of Sepsis (GenIMS) Study Investigators (2011) Plasma neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin predicts recovery from acute kidney injury following community-acquired pneumonia. *Kidney Int* 80:545-52

18. Alves SC¹, Tomasi CD, Constantino L, Giombelli V, Candal R, Bristot Mde L, Topanotti MF, Burdmann EA, Dal-Pizzol F, Fraga CM, Ritter C (2013) Hypomagnesemia as a risk factor for the non-recovery of the renal function in critically ill patients with acute kidney injury. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 28:910-6
19. Wehbe E, Duncan AE, Dar G, Budev M, Stephany B (2013) Recovery from AKI and Short- and Long-Term Outcomes after Lung Transplantation. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 8:19-25
20. Kopolovic I¹, Simmonds K, Duggan S, Ewanchuk M, Stollery DE, Bagshaw SM (2013) Risk factors and outcomes associated with acute kidney injury following ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm. *BMC Nephrol* 14:99
21. Flores-Gama C¹, Merino M, Baranda F, Cruz DN, Ronco C, Vazquez-Rangel A (2013) The impact of integrating nephrologists into the postoperative cardiac intensive care unit: a cohort study. *Cardiorenal Med* 3:79-88
22. Lu R¹, Muciño-Bermejo MJ, Armignacco P, Fang Y, Cai H, Zhang M, Dai H, Zhang W, Ni Z, Qian J, Yan Y, Ronco C (2014) Survey of Acute Kidney Injury and Related Risk Factors of Mortality in Hospitalized Patients in a Third-Level Urban Hospital of Shanghai. *Blood Purif* 38:140-148
23. Harris DG, McCrone MP, Koo G, Weltz AS, Chiu WC, Scalea TM, Diaz JJ, Lissauer ME (2015) Epidemiology and outcomes of acute kidney injury in critically ill surgical patients. *J Crit Care* 30:102-6
24. Yang F, Zhang L, Wu H, Zou H, Du Y (2014) Clinical analysis of cause, treatment and prognosis in acute kidney injury patients. *PLoS One* 9:e85214
25. Gammelager H, Christiansen CF, Johansen MB, Tønnesen E, Jespersen B, Sørensen HT (2014) Three-year risk of cardiovascular disease among intensive care patients with acute kidney injury: a population-based cohort study. *Crit Care* 18:492
26. Fidalgo P, Ahmed M, Meyer SR, Lien D, Weinkauf J, Cardoso FS, Jackson K, Bagshaw SM (2014) Incidence and outcomes of acute kidney injury following orthotopic lung transplantation: a population-based cohort study. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 29:1702-9

27. Meersch M, Schmidt C, Van Aken H, Martens S, Rossaint J, Singbartl K, Görlich D, Kellum JA, Zarbock A (2014) Urinary TIMP-2 and IGFBP7 as early biomarkers of acute kidney injury and renal recovery following cardiac surgery. *PLoS One* 9:e93460
28. KDIGO Clinical Practice Guideline for Acute Kidney Injury (2012) *Kidney Intern* 2: 1-138
29. Kellum JA (2014) How can we define recovery after acute kidney injury? Considerations from epidemiology and clinical trial design. *Nephron Clin Pract* 127:81-8
30. Bagshaw SM¹, Uchino S, Cruz D, Bellomo R, Morimatsu H, Morgera S, Schetz M, Tan I, Bouman C, Macedo E, Gibney N, Tolwani A, Oudemans-van Straaten HM, Ronco C, Kellum JA; Beginning and Ending Supportive Therapy for the Kidney (BEST Kidney) Investigators (2009) A comparison of observed versus estimated baseline creatinine for determination of RIFLE class in patients with acute kidney injury. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 24:2739-44.
31. Siew ED¹, Ikizler TA, Matheny ME, Shi Y, Schildcrout JS, Danciu I, Dwyer JP, Srichai M, Hung AM, Smith JP, Peterson JF (2012) Estimating baseline kidney function in hospitalized patients with impaired kidney function. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 7:712-9.
32. Závada J¹, Hoste E, Cartin-Ceba R, Calzavacca P, Gajic O, Clermont G, Bellomo R, Kellum JA; AKI6 investigators (2010) A comparison of three methods to estimate baseline creatinine for RIFLE classification. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 25:3911-8
33. Casaer MP, Mesotten D, Hermans G, Wouters PJ, Schetz M, Meyfroidt G, Van Cromphaut S, Ingels C, Meersseman P, Muller J, Vlasselaers D, Debaveye Y, Desmet L, Dubois J, Van Assche A, Vanderheyden S, Wilmer A, Van den Berghe G (2011) Early versus late parenteral nutrition in critically ill adults. *N Engl J Med* 365:506-17
34. National Kidney Foundation (2002) K/DOQI clinical practice guidelines for chronic kidney disease: Evaluation, classification, and stratification. *Kidney Disease Outcome Quality Initiative*. *Am J Kidney Dis* 39 (suppl 2): S1-S246

35. Gunst JI, Vanhorebeek I, Casaer MP, Hermans G, Wouters PJ, Dubois J, Claes K, Schetz M, Van den Berghe G (2013) Impact of early parenteral nutrition on metabolism and kidney injury. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 24:995-1005
36. Khosla N, Soroko SB, Chertow GM, Himmelfarb J, Ikizler TA, Paganini E, Mehta RL; Program to Improve Care in Acute Renal Disease (PICARD) (2009) Preexisting chronic kidney disease: a potential for improved outcomes from acute kidney injury. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 4:1914-9
37. Schetz M, Gunst J, Van den Berghe G (2014) The impact of using estimated GFR versus creatinine clearance on the evaluation of recovery from acute kidney injury in the ICU. *Intensive Care Med* 40:1709-17
38. Prowle JR, Kolic I, Purdell-Lewis J, Taylor R, Pearse RM, Kirwan CJ (2014) Serum creatinine changes associated with critical illness and detection of persistent renal dysfunction after AKI. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2014 9:1015-23
39. Kellum JA, Sileanu FE, Murugan R, Lucko N, Shaw AD, Clermont G. Classifying AKI by Urine Output versus Serum Creatinine Level. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2015 Jan 7. pii: ASN.2014070724. [Epub ahead of print]
40. Levey AS, Stevens LA, Schmid CH, Zhang YL, Castro AF 3rd, Feldman HI, Kusek JW, Eggers P, Van Lente F, Greene T, Coresh J; CKD-EPI (Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration) (2009) A new equation to estimate glomerular filtration rate. *Ann Intern Med* 150:604-12.
41. Harel ZI, Wald R, Bargman JM, Mamdani M, Etchells E, Garg AX, Ray JG, Luo J, Li P, Quinn RR, Forster A, Perl J, Bell CM (2013) Nephrologist follow-up improves all-cause mortality of severe acute kidney injury survivors. *Kidney Int* 83:901-8.
42. Levin A, Stevens PE (2011) Early detection of CKD: the benefits, limitations and effects on prognosis. *Nat Rev Nephrol* 7:446-57.

Table 1. Kidney outcome of different AKI_{max} stages (absent recovery shown in dark gray, partial recovery in light gray) - A.in the total population - B. in survivors only

A. AKI discharge		No AKI	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3 no RRT	Stage 3 RRT
AKI max	Frequency- n (%)					
Stage 1 0,3	160 (12.2)	154 (96.2)	6 (3.8)			
Stage 1 50%	425 (34.4)	358 (84.2)	54 (12.7)	9 (2.1)	4 (0.9)	
Stage 2	213 (16.3)	151 (70.9)	40 (18.8)	20 (9.4)	2 (0.9)	
Stage 3 no RRT	164 (12.5)	87 (53)	24 (14.6)	31 (18.9)	21 (12.8)	1 (0.6)
Stage 3 RRT	348 (26.6)	128 (36.8)	27 (7.8)	18 (5.2)	6 (1.7)	169 (48.6)
	1310	878 (67)	151 (11.5)	78 (6)	33 (2.5)	170 (13)

B. AKI discharge		No AKI	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3 no RRT	Stage 3 RRT
AKI max	Frequency - n (%)					
Stage 1 0,3	142 (14.5)	138 (97.2)	4 (2.8)			
Stage 1 50%	372 (38)	320 (86)	44 (11.8)	7 (1.9)	1 (0.3)	
Stage 2	169 (17.3)	136 (80.5)	25 (14.8)	7 (4.1)	1 (0.6)	
Stage 3 no RRT	113 (11.6)	74 (65.5)	20 (17.7)	16 (14.2)	2 (1.8)	1 (0.9)
Stage 3 RRT	181 (18.5)	108 (59.6)	24 (13.3)	17 (9.4)	3 (1.7)	29 (16)
	977	776 (79.4)	117 (12)	47 (4.8)	7 (0.7)	30 (3.1)

Table 2. Frequency of complete recovery (n-%) in AKI survivors assessed with different definitions (* comparison with KDIGO)

	All AKI	P value* Bowker's test	Kappa (CI)*	Stage 1 0,3	Stage 1 50%	Stage 2	Stage 3 no RRT	Stage 3 RRT
KDIGO	776 (79.4)			138 (97.2)	320 (86)	136 (80.5)	74 (65.5)	108 (59.7)
Within 1,25 times baseline	646 (66.1)	<0.0001	0.67 (0.62-0.72)	133 (93.6)	262 (70.4)	104 (61.5)	60 (53.1)	87 (48.1)
Return to baseline	410 (42)	<0.0001	0.45 (0.41-0.50)	95 (66.9)	145 (39)	72 (42.6)	43 (38)	55 (30.4)
Absence of new or worsening CKD	687 (70.3)	<0.0001	0.58 (0.52-0.64)	12 (8.4)	87 (23.4)	48 (28.4)	50 (44.2)	93 (51.4)

Table 3. Kidney outcome of different AKI stages (with the exception of stage 1 0,3) in surviving patients - A. patients with available baseline and without CKD and development and recovery assessed with the true baseline (n=411) B. patients with available baseline and without CKD and development and recovery assessed with the imputed baseline (n=291) - C. patients with both development and recovery assessed with imputed baseline (n=258) (p-values for the distribution between complete, partial and no recovery are reported in Fig 3B)

A. AKI disch		No AKI	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3 no RRT	Stage 3 RRT
AKI max	Frequency - n (%)					
Stage 1 50%	231(56.2)	193 (83.5)	31 (13.4)	6 (2.6)	1 (0.4)	
Stage 2	93 (22.6)	74 (79.6)	15 (16.1)	3 (3.2)	1 (1.1)	
Stage 3 no RRT	41 (10)	31 (75.6)	8 (19.5)	1 (2.4)	1 (2.4)	
Stage 3 RRT	46 (11.2)	30 (65.2)	6 (13)	6 (13)	2 (4.3)	2 (4.3)
	411	328 (79.8)	60 (14.6)	16 (3.9)	5 (1.2)	2 (0.5)

B. AKI disch		No AKI	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3 no RRT	Stage 3 RRT
AKI max	Frequency - n (%)					
Stage 1 50%	143 (49.1)	127 (88.8)	13 (9.1)	2 (1.4)	1 (0.7)	
Stage 2	85 (29.2)	70 (82.3)	13 (15.3)	2 (2.4)		
Stage 3 no RRT	17 (5.8)	15 (88.2)	2 (11.8)			
Stage 3 RRT	46 (15.8)	35 (76.1)	5 (10.9)	3 (6.5)	1 (2.2)	2 (4.4)
	291	247 (84.9)	33 (11.3)	7 (2.4)	2 (0.7)	2 (0.7)

C. AKI disch		No AKI	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3 no RRT	Stage 3 RRT
AKI max	Frequency - n (%)					
Stage 1 50%	72 (25.2)	62 (86.1)	9 (12.5)	1 (1.4)		
Stage 2	45 (15.7)	34 (75.6)	7 (15.6)	4 (8.9)		
Stage 3 no RRT	58 (20.3)	31 (53.4)	12 (20.7)	13 (22.4)	1 (1.7)	1 (1.7)
Stage 3 RRT	83 (29)	47 (56.6)	15 (18.1)	9 (10.8)	1 (1.2)	11 (13.3)
	258	174 (67.4)	43 (16.7)	27 (10.5)	2 (0.8)	12 (4.7)

Table 4: baseline characteristics and general outcome of surviving AKI patients with true (available) and imputed (unavailable) baseline (p₁ for comparison of patients with available versus unavailable baseline; p₂ for comparison of no CKD patients with available baseline versus patients with unavailable baseline). Abbreviations: Screat = serum creatinine, eGFR = estimated GFR, CKD = chronic kidney disease, HD = hemodynamic support, MV = mechanical ventilation

	Available baseline n=577	Available baseline no CKD n= 411	Unavailable baseline n=258	p ₁	p ₂
Demographics					
Age (y) median (IQR)	67.9 (58.1-75.6)	65.1 (55.7-73.9)	66 (55.5-76.5)	0.56	0.25
Male gender - n (%)	347(60.1)	260 (63.3)	157 (60.9)	0.84	0.53
Comorbidity					
Diabetes - n (%)	134 (23.2)	86 (20.9)	38 (14.7)	0.004	0.042
Malignancy - n (%)	183 (31.7)	145 (35.3)	28 (10.9)	<0.0001	<0.0001
Baseline Screat mg/dL (median IQR)	0.88 (0.67-1.16)	0.76 (0.58-0.91)	0.97 (0.79-1.00)	0.21	<0.0001
Calculated baseline mg/dL (median IQR) p value for difference true-calc	0.97 (0.78-1.00) 0.66	0.97 (0.79-1.00) <0.0001	0.97 (0.79-1.00)	0.53	0.40
Acute illness					
Emergency admission - n (%)	281 (48.7)	215 (52.3)	258 (100)	<0.0001	<0.0001
Surgical admission - n (%)	495 (85.8)	350 (85.2)	189 (73.3)	<0.0001	0.0002
Sepsis on admission - n (%)	200 (34.7)	160 (38.9)	137 (53.1)	<0.0001	0.0003
Apache II score (median IQR)	26 (20-35)	27 (18-35)	37 (32-40)	<0.0001	<0.0001
Max lactate d1 mmol/L (median IQR) (n=577)	2.2 (1.6-3.3)	2.3 (1.7-3.6)	2.3 (1.4-3.7)	0.91	0.45

Need for HD support	522 (90.5)	365 (88.8)	217 (84.1)	0.0094	0.08
Need for MV	539 (93.4)	386 (93.9)	238 (92.2)	0.54	0.40
Characteristics AKI					
Adm Screat mg/dL Median (IQR)	1.31 (0.93-1.86)	1.18 (0.84-1.57)	1.76 (1.27-2.89)	<0.0001	<0.0001
AKI on admission n (% of all AKI)	285 (49.4)	235 (57.2)	193 (74.9)	<0.0001	<0.0001
Early AKI (within 48h) n (% of all AKI)	461 (79.9)	343 (83.5)	224 (86.8)	0.014	0.23
AKI max				<0.0001	<0.0001
Stage 1 50%	300 (52)	231 (56.2)	72 (27.9)		
Stage 2	124 (21.5)	93 (22.6)	45 (17.4)		
Stage 3	55 (9.5)	41 (10)	58 (22.5)		
Stage 3 RRT	98 (17)	46 (11.2)	83 (32.2)		
Outcome					
ICU stay	7 (4-15)	7 (4-15)	11 (5-23)	<0.0001	<0.0001
Hospital stay	27 (17-48)	28 (17-48)	35.5 (19-59)	0.0019	0.0029